

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the claim amendments made herein do not adequately resolve the issues identified by the Examiner in the pending Office Action.

Summary of the Office Action

The drawings stand objected to because in Fig. 7H, drain contact hole h3 (of Fig. 7G) through the second inorganic material layer 152 is absent.

Claim 21 stands objected to because of informalities.

Claims 1-5, 8-15 and 17-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as the invention.

Claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ha et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058389) in view of Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/041470887).

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ha et al. as modified by Maeda et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Kubota et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0171792).

Claims 11-15 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ha et al. as modified by Maeda et al. and Kuboda et al., as applied to claim 10 above.

Summary of the Amendment

Claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings stand objected to because in Fig. 7H, drain contact hole h3 (of Fig. 7G) through the second inorganic material layer 152 is absent. To overcome the Office's objection to the drawings, Applicants have amended the drawings to correct minor informalities, namely "h3" has been deleted." No new matter has been introduced. Thus, the Office's objection to the drawings is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Objection to Claim

Claim 21 stands objected to because of the informalities. To overcome the Office's objection to the claim, Applicants have amended claim 21 to correct minor informalities, namely "substantially" has been deleted." No new matter has been introduced. Thus, the Office's objection to the claims is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 21 be withdrawn.

All Claims Comply With 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-5, 8-15 and 17-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Final Office Action alleges that claim 1 recites "a drain electrode being an electrode attached to a drain region of the thin film transistor and not overlapping the pixel region", which is unclear to the Examiner for the reason that the scope of the claim language does not appear to be in concordance with Applicants' arguments pertaining to the scope of the claim language. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, in part, "a drain electrode being an electrode directly connected to a drain region of the thin film transistor and not overlapping the pixel region." No new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

All Claims Recite Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ha et al. in view of Maeda et al. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ha et al. as modified by Maeda et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Kubota et al. Claims 11-15 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ha et al. as modified by Maeda et al. and Kuboda et al., as applied to claim 10 above.

These rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites, for example, a combination of elements, “...wherein the thin film transistor is disposed within the switching portion”... “wherein the plurality of uneven patterns are disposed within the reflective portion”... “wherein the reflective layer disposed on the pixel region and not overlapping the drain electrode...” Claim 10 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 10 recites, for example, a combination of elements, “...wherein the thin film transistor is disposed within the switching portion”... “wherein the plurality of uneven patterns are disposed within the reflective portion”... “wherein the reflective layer disposed on the pixel region and not overlapping the drain electrode...” Claim 12 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 12 recites, for example, a combination of elements, “...wherein the thin film transistor is disposed within the switching portion”... “wherein the plurality of uneven patterns are disposed within the reflective portion”... “wherein the reflective layer disposed on the pixel region and not overlapping the drain electrode...”...” Claim 19 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 19 recites, for example, a combination of elements, “...wherein the thin film transistor is disposed within the switching portion”... “wherein the plurality of uneven patterns are disposed within the reflective portion”... “wherein the reflective layer disposed on the pixel region and not overlapping the drain electrode...” Claim 21 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 21 recites, for example, a combination of elements, “...wherein the thin film transistor is disposed within the switching portion”... “wherein the plurality of uneven patterns are disposed within the reflective portion”... “wherein the reflective layer disposed on the pixel region and

not overlapping the drain electrode..." Ha et al. and Maeda et al. fail to teach or suggest at least the limitation of the claimed invention. For at least the above reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5 and 8-9, claim 10 and its dependent claim 11, claim 12 and its dependent claims 13-15 and 17-18, claim 19 and its dependent claim 20, and claim 21 are allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the Response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

Dated: March 22, 2011

By: /Mary Jane Boswell/
Mary Jane Boswell, Reg. No. 33,652

Customer No. 009629

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202-739-3000
Fax: 202-739-3001